

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/007,807

Applicant(s)

TAKEDA, HIDEYUKI

Examiner

Greg Bengzon

Art Unit

2144

All Participants:(1) Greg Bengzon.

(2) _____.

Status of Application: _____(3) Edward Lin.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 30 May 2007**Time:** _____**Type of Interview:**☒ Telephonic☐ Video Conference☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

Claim 6

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Upon receiving authorization from SPE Vaughn, Examiner contacted applicant representative to suggest claim amendments that clarify limitation reciting 'management information that identify a timer module'. Amendments should clarify what a timer module is, what functionality is derived from timer module. Atty. Lin will consider making claim amendments .

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/007,807

Applicant(s)

TAKEDA, HIDEYUKI

Examiner

Greg Bengzon

Art Unit

2144

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Greg Bengzon.

(3) Edward Lin.

(2) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 08 June 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: none.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Upon further clarification of the claims and submission of claim amendments Atty. Lin has granted authorization to the Examiner to make an Examiners Amendment with regards to the newly submitted claims.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required